IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 91,875-J)

PATENT

#8 K. Dorsel 1/23/96

In application of:	)	
	)	
McBride and Dean	)	**Before the Examiner:**
	)	**M. Hartley**
Serial No. 08/253,973	)	
	)	**Group Art Unit: 1208**
Filed: June 3, 1994	)	
	)	
For: Monoamine, Diamide, Thiol-containing Metal Chelating Agents	)	

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Restriction Requirement mailed December 5, 1995, Applicants elect with traverse to prosecute Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 26 and 31, designated as Group I by the Examiner. Applicants' bases of traversing this restriction requirement are as follows.

Claim 4 is not grouped in any of the Groups defined by the Examiner, and accordingly no basis is provided for restriction of this claim from Group I. Applicants respectfully request that this claim be added to Group I by the Examiner, and examined with Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 26 and 31.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction of Claims 7-10, designated as Group II; Claims 11, 12 and 15-17, designated as Group III, and Claims 13 and 14, designated as Group VI. The Restriction Requirement asserts that "Group I and II, as well as III and VI, are related as mutually-exclusive species...". Applicants respectfully contend that these groups are related as being drawn to reagents for preparing radiopharmaceuticals, comprising a specific class of

radiometal binding moiety covalently linked to a targetting moiety, preferably a peptide. Applicants further traverse the restriction requirement by asserting that the rational basis for defining the Groups based on the Patent Office system of classification is unclear to Applicants, and they respectfully request that the Examiner clarify the basis for differentiating the inventions claimed in Groups II, III and VI from Group I. Inspection of these claims indicates that the claimed compounds are similar in their structural formulae and by the positive recitation of the components of the claimed reagents, all of which are directed at the preparation of radiophamaceuticals. Applicants respectfully submit that this similarity suggests that examination of Claims 1-17, 26 and 31 as a group would not put an undue burden on the Patent Office. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider this restriction, and examine claims 1-17, 26 and 31 together.

Applicants provisionally elect the species that is a compound identified in the specification as P829 and having the formula shown in Table VI in the specification on page 48.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & ALLEGRETTI, LTD.

Date: January 4, 1996

By: _____
Kevin E. Noonan, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 35,303